

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/534,488	INADA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DIMPLE N. BODAWALA	1791	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Dimple N. Bodawala (Examiner).

(3) Sheetal Patel (Applicant's representative). *S.S.P.*

(2) Philip Tucker (SPE).

(4) Ryo Kuninaka (Applicant's representative). *R.K.*

Date of Interview: 14 January 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Suzuki et al. (JP 2001-322148).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: (See attached sheet).

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Dimple N Bodawala/
Examiner, Art Unit 1791

During the interview, Applicant's representative argues that the inner holder of the invention does not have an annular holder. Examiners suggested to amend the independent claim to teach the inner holder does not have a holding portion at the outer circumferential edge of the front end of the holder as taught in instant application, wherein such proposed amendment may overcome the prior art rejection. With respect to part (d) of claim 1, examiner indicated the limitations are cited as intended use of an apparatus and would not be distinguishing over the prior art.